

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10–35. Claims 10, 13, 16, 23, 27, 28, 33, and 35 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention. Claims 25 and 34 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1–9 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. As a result, claims 10–24, 26–33, and 35 are pending for examination with claims 10 and 23 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al (US Publication No. 2007/0118670) (“Viswanath”) in view of Greer et al. (US Patent No. 5,978,828) (“Greer”). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Greer and in further view of Boehm (US Publication No. 2004/0085944) (“Boehm”). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Greer and in further view of Nelson (US Publication No. 2003/0055975) (“Nelson”). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 17–21 and 27–33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Greer and in further view of Non–Patent Literature reference “Dynamic Parallel Access to Replicated Content in the Internet” by Pablo Rodriguez and Ernst Biersack (“Rodriguez”). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Greer and in further view of Holder (US Publication No. 2003/0208554) (“Holder”).

Amendment

Application Number: 10/695,928

Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

In the FOA, the Examiner holds the Applicant's remarks of 10-19-2007 to be non-persuasive and maintains the previous rejection. The Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection and assertions against Applicant's remarks of 10-19-2007. Even so, Applicant is amending some of the claims to further recite the features of the invention in order to move prosecution forward.

Accordingly, the Applicant has amended claim 10 to call for:

“...determining a number of available wireless network interfaces, each of the available wireless network interfaces communicatively coupled to a distinct wireless network of a plurality of wireless networks that are communicatively coupled to the remote computer (paras 19, 21, 25); ...and wherein the objects in the virtual resource are requested via a plurality of the available wireless network interfaces. (paras 17, 28, 42, ” (underlining and bolding added for emphasis; parenthetical references indicate at least one instance of support in the original specification)

The Applicant has similarly amended claim 23. Claims 13, 16, 27, 28, 33, and 35 have also been amended for consistency with the independent claims and to address other matters, including matters of antecedent basis and claim clarity. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, at least as indicated herein above.

Amendment  
Application Number: 10/695,928  
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

Neither Viswanath, Greer, Boehm, Nelson, Rodriguez, nor Holder, alone or in combined, teach, disclose, or suggest determining the plurality of objects that comprise a single resource and requesting those objects over multiple wireless network interfaces and distinct wireless networks.

Rodriguez, in particular, may teach downloading “portions of a document” over “the Internet” and from “multiple servers” (see Rodriguez, paras 2, 3, Abstract, etc.), but Rodriguez does not teach, disclose, or suggest determining the plurality of objects of a resource and requesting those objects over multiple wireless network interfaces and distinct wireless networks. “Portions of a document” are not the same as “objects of a resource”, and “the Internet” is not the same as “multiple wireless network interfaces and distinct wireless networks”.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that independent claims 10 and 23 are not unpatentable over Viswanath, even in view of Greer, Boehm, Nelson, Rodriguez, and/or Holder. As such, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

Claims 11–22, 24, 26–33, and 35 are dependent on either claim 10 or 23. As such, claims 11–22, 24, 26–33, and 35 are believed allowable based at least in part upon claim 10 or 35.

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above–referenced application is requested.

Amendment  
Application Number: 10/695,928  
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: February 27, 2008

By: /L. Alan Collins/  
L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646  
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

February 27, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Amendment  
Application Number: 10/695,928  
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01